

yw



# UNITED STATES PATENT AND TRADEMARK OFFICE

UNITED STATES DEPARTMENT OF COMMERCE  
 United States Patent and Trademark Office  
 Address: COMMISSIONER FOR PATENTS  
 P.O. Box 1450  
 Alexandria, Virginia 22313-1450  
 www.uspto.gov

APPLICATION NO.	FILING DATE	FIRST NAMED INVENTOR	ATTORNEY DOCKET NO.	CONFIRMATION NO.
-----------------	-------------	----------------------	---------------------	------------------

09/769,943

01/26/2001

Christopher M. Jagers

M-8783 US

5515

7590

02/23/2005

David L. Combs  
 Haynes and Boone, LLP  
 901 Main Street, Suite 3100  
 Dallas, TX 75202-3789

EXAMINER

ORGAD, EDAN

ART UNIT

PAPER NUMBER

2684

DATE MAILED: 02/23/2005

Please find below and/or attached an Office communication concerning this application or proceeding.

<b>Office Action Summary</b>	<b>Application No.</b> 09/769,943	<b>Applicant(s)</b> JAGGERS ET AL.	
	<b>Examiner</b> Edan Orgad	<b>Art Unit</b> 2684	

-- The MAILING DATE of this communication appears on the cover sheet with the correspondence address --

#### Period for Reply

A SHORTENED STATUTORY PERIOD FOR REPLY IS SET TO EXPIRE 3 MONTH(S) FROM THE MAILING DATE OF THIS COMMUNICATION.

- Extensions of time may be available under the provisions of 37 CFR 1.136(a). In no event, however, may a reply be timely filed after SIX (6) MONTHS from the mailing date of this communication.
- If the period for reply specified above is less than thirty (30) days, a reply within the statutory minimum of thirty (30) days will be considered timely.
- If NO period for reply is specified above, the maximum statutory period will apply and will expire SIX (6) MONTHS from the mailing date of this communication.
- Failure to reply within the set or extended period for reply will, by statute, cause the application to become ABANDONED (35 U.S.C. § 133). Any reply received by the Office later than three months after the mailing date of this communication, even if timely filed, may reduce any earned patent term adjustment. See 37 CFR 1.704(b).

#### Status

- 1) ☒ Responsive to communication(s) filed on 29 October 2004.
- 2a) ☐ This action is **FINAL**.                      2b) ☒ This action is non-final.
- 3) ☐ Since this application is in condition for allowance except for formal matters, prosecution as to the merits is closed in accordance with the practice under *Ex parte Quayle*, 1935 C.D. 11, 453 O.G. 213.

#### Disposition of Claims

- 4) ☒ Claim(s) 1-5, 7, 8, 17-20, 22-27 is/are pending in the application.
- 4a) Of the above claim(s) \_\_\_\_\_ is/are withdrawn from consideration.
- 5) ☐ Claim(s) \_\_\_\_\_ is/are allowed.
- 6) ☒ Claim(s) 1-5, 7, 8, 17-20, 22-27 is/are rejected.
- 7) ☐ Claim(s) \_\_\_\_\_ is/are objected to.
- 8) ☐ Claim(s) \_\_\_\_\_ are subject to restriction and/or election requirement.

#### Application Papers

- 9) ☐ The specification is objected to by the Examiner.
- 10) ☐ The drawing(s) filed on \_\_\_\_\_ is/are: a) ☐ accepted or b) ☐ objected to by the Examiner.  
Applicant may not request that any objection to the drawing(s) be held in abeyance. See 37 CFR 1.85(a).  
Replacement drawing sheet(s) including the correction is required if the drawing(s) is objected to. See 37 CFR 1.121(d).
- 11) ☐ The oath or declaration is objected to by the Examiner. Note the attached Office Action or form PTO-152.

#### Priority under 35 U.S.C. § 119

- 12) ☐ Acknowledgment is made of a claim for foreign priority under 35 U.S.C. § 119(a)-(d) or (f).
- a) ☐ All    b) ☐ Some \*    c) ☐ None of:
1. ☐ Certified copies of the priority documents have been received.
2. ☐ Certified copies of the priority documents have been received in Application No. \_\_\_\_\_.
3. ☐ Copies of the certified copies of the priority documents have been received in this National Stage application from the International Bureau (PCT Rule 17.2(a)).

\* See the attached detailed Office action for a list of the certified copies not received.

#### Attachment(s)

- |  |   |
|--|---|
| 1) <input checked="" type="checkbox"/> Notice of References Cited (PTO-892)  | 4) <input type="checkbox"/> Interview Summary (PTO-413)<br>Paper No(s)/Mail Date. _____ |
| 2) <input type="checkbox"/> Notice of Draftsperson's Patent Drawing Review (PTO-948)                                   | 5) <input type="checkbox"/> Notice of Informal Patent Application (PTO-152)             |
| 3) <input type="checkbox"/> Information Disclosure Statement(s) (PTO-1449 or PTO/SB/08)<br>Paper No(s)/Mail Date _____ | 6) <input type="checkbox"/> Other: _____  |

## **DETAILED ACTION**

### ***Response to Arguments***

Applicant's arguments with respect to claims 1-5, 7, 8, 17-20 and 22-27 have been considered but are moot in view of the new ground(s) of rejection.

It should be noted, that applicant's argument with respect to examiner lack of establishing a case of prima-facie of obviousness are not valid because the arguments are related to claims as filed in the after final. Therefore, in view of examiner's new art rejection, newly filed claims have rendered applicant's arguments moot.

### ***Claim Rejections - 35 USC § 103***

The following is a quotation of 35 U.S.C. 103(a) which forms the basis for all obviousness rejections set forth in this Office action:

(a) A patent may not be obtained though the invention is not identically disclosed or described as set forth in section 102 of this title, if the differences between the subject matter sought to be patented and the prior art are such that the subject matter as a whole would have been obvious at the time the invention was made to a person having ordinary skill in the art to which said subject matter pertains. Patentability shall not be negated by the manner in which the invention was made.

Claim 1– 4 are rejected under 35 U.S.C. 103(a) as being unpatentable over Helstab et al. (Helstab, US Patent No. 6,073,031) in view of Ali et al (US No. 2003/0197679) and further in view Nojima et al (Nojima, US Patent No. 6,336,038).

Regarding claim 1, Helstab teaches of a docking station for a wireless communication device (Figure 1b), the docking station comprising: a support structure a cradle situated in the support structure to receive the wireless communication device (col. 3, lines 3-5 and col. 4, lines 2-7); a display situated in the support structure (col. 3, line 3 -5) and an energy source internal to the docking station which supplies energy to the wireless communication device when the

Art Unit: 2684

wireless communication device is received in the cradle (col. 4, lines 28 -32 and col. 4, lines 48-52).

Helstab does not specifically teach said docking station supplies energy to the docking station to a rechargeable energy source in the wireless communication device when the docking station is mobile.

In related art dealing with wireless equipment and docking stations, Ali teaches said docking station supplies energy to the docking station to a rechargeable energy source in the wireless communication device when the docking station is mobile (see Ali, ¶ 0065).

It would have been obvious to one skilled in the art at the time of invention to have included into Helstab's docking station, Ali's rechargeable means while the docking is mobile to provide wireless mobility to the user while in transit and further enhance the usability of the wireless device by providing a mobile charging station.

Helstab does not specifically teach of (a display situated in the support structure to display information received by the docking station from the wireless communications device (note the brackets are provided for clarity in language and that it is believed that these limitations have been addressed in the above).

In a related art dealing with a cellular information terminal, Nojima teaches of (a display situated in the support structure) to display information received by the docking station from the wireless communications device (col. 3, line 64 and col.4, line 4).

It would have been obvious to one skilled in the art at the time of invention to have included into Helstab's docking station, Nojima's data displaying capabilities, for the purposes of displaying user specific data and information (such as email), as taught by Nojima.

Art Unit: 2684

Regarding claim 2, Helstab teaches of a docking station for a wireless communication device, the docking station comprising: a docking housing (col. 3, lines 3 -5 and col. 4, lines 2-7) a display device, situated in the docking housing (col. 3, line 3-5); a cradle disposed on the docking housing, that receives the wireless communication device (col. 4, lines 2-7) a connector, situated in the cradle, that electrically couples the docking station to the wireless communication device (col. 4, lines 48-51); an internal voltage source situated in the docking housing (col. 4, lines 28-32); a charging circuit, situated in the docking housing, for charging a voltage source (col. 4, lines 28-32); and a switch for selectively coupling the charging circuit to the internal voltage source (col. 4, lines 44 -57 and col. 4, lines 65-67).

Helstab does not specifically teach said docking station supplies energy to the docking station to a rechargeable energy source in the wireless communication device when the docking station is mobile.

In related art dealing with wireless equipment and docking stations, Ali teaches said docking station supplies energy to the docking station to a rechargeable energy source in the wireless communication device when the docking station is mobile (see Ali, ¶ 0065).

It would have been obvious to one skilled in the art at the time of invention to have included into Helstab's docking station, Ali's rechargeable means while the docking is mobile to provide wireless mobility to the user while in transit and further enhance the usability of the wireless device by providing a mobile charging station.

Helstab does not specifically teach of (a display device, situated in the docking housing) that displays information received from the wireless communication device (note the brackets are

Art Unit: 2684

provided for clarity in language and that it is believed that these limitations have been addressed in the above).

In a related art dealing with a cellular information terminal, Nojima teaches of (a display device, situated in the docking housing) that displays information received from the wireless communication device (col. 3, line 64 and col. 4, line 4).

It would have been obvious to one skilled in the art at the time of invention to have included into Helstab's docking station, Nojima's data displaying capabilities, for the purposes of displaying user specific data and information (such as email), as taught by Nojima.

Regarding claim 3, Helstab teaches of wherein the connector comprises a first terminal coupled to the internal voltage source (col. 4, lines 48-54).

Regarding claim 4, Helstab teaches of wherein the connector comprises a second terminal selectively coupled to the charging circuit through the switch (col. 4, lines 48-53 and col. 4, lines 65-67).

Claim 5 is rejected under 35 U.S.C. 103(a) as being unpatentable over Helstab et al. (Helstab, US Patent No. 6,073,031) in view of Ali et al (US No. 2003/0197679) and Nojima et al (Nojima, US Patent No. 6,336,038) as applied to claim 4 above, and further in view of Uchiynma (US No. 2002/00723).

Regarding claim 5, Helstab and Nojima do not specifically teach of wherein the connector comprises a third terminal coupled to GND.

In a related art dealing with docking stations, Uchiyama teaches of wherein the connector comprises a third terminal coupled to GND (paragraph 0038). It would have been obvious to one

Art Unit: 2684

skilled in the art at the time of invention to have included into Helstab and Nojima's charging system, Uchiyama's circuit topology, for the purposes of current flow and therefore charging), as taught by Uchiyama.

Claims 7 and 8 are rejected under 35 U.S.C. 103(a) as being unpatentable over Helstab et al. (Helstab, US Patent No. 6,073,031) in view of Ali et al (US No. 2003/0197679) and further in view Nojima et al (Nojima, US Patent No. 6,336,038) as applied to claim 4 above, and further in view of Obata et al. (Obata, US Patent No. 5,960,208).

Regarding claim 7, Helstab and Nojima do not specifically teach of wherein the switch a pole coupled to the charging circuit and has a first terminal selectively coupled to the first terminal of the connector (though it should be noted that in presence detected, as per col. 4, lines 65 -67 and col. 6, line 48-53).

In a related art dealing with a portable terminal and cradle, Obata teaches of wherein the switch has a pole coupled to the charging circuit and has a first terminal selectively coupled to the first terminal of the connector (col. 10, lines 30-38, col. 18, lines 1-19).

It would have been obvious to one skilled in the art at the time of invention, to have included into Helstab and Nojima's charging system, Obata's circuit topology, for the purpose of selectively charging the mobile's battery upon need (as when the battery falls below a specified level), as taught Obata.

Regarding claim 8, Helstab and Obata further teach of wherein the switch has a second terminal selectively coupled to the second terminal of the connector (Helstab: col. 4, lines 48-53 and col. 4, lines 65-67 and Obata: col. 10, lines 30-38, col. 18, lines 1-19).

Art Unit: 2684

Claim 17 is rejected under 35 U.S.C. 103(a) as being unpatentable over Helstab et al. (Helstab, US Patent No. 6,073,031) in view of Ali et al (US No. 2003/0197679) and Nojima et al. (Nojima, US Patent No. 6,336,038) and further in view of Freadman (Freadman, US Patent No. 6,546,262).

Regarding claim 17, Helstab in view of Nojima do not specifically teach of further comprising a video interface coupled to the display device and operable to transform a video signal generated by the wireless communication device into a video signal that is compatible with the display device.

In a related art dealing with handsets and cradle devices, Freadman teaches of further comprising a video interface coupled to the display device and operable to transform a video signal generated by the wireless communication device into a video signal that is compatible with the display device (col. 3, lines 54-63).

It would have been obvious to one skilled in the art at the time of invention to have included into Helstab and Nojima's docking station, Freadman's video output, for the purposes of displaying characters and images from a smaller screen to a larger one, as taught by Freadman.

Claims 18-20 are rejected under 35 U.S.C. 103(a) as being unpatentable over Helstab et al. (Helstab, US Patent No. 6,073,031) in view of Ali et al (US No. 2003/0197679) and further in view of Nojima et al. (Nojima, US Patent No. 6,336,038) and Obata et al. (Obata, US Patent No. 5,960,208).

Regarding claim 18, Helstab teaches of a docking station for a wireless communications



Art Unit: 2684

device comprising: a display device that displays information (col. 3, line 3-5); and an apparatus that selectively supplies power to the communications device (Figure 2a), the apparatus including: a connector for electrically coupling the docking station to the communications device the connector having at least first and second terminals (col. 4, lines 48 -54 and col. 4, lines 65-67)., the switch operable in response to status information indicating whether a communications device is docked at the docking station (2a; col. 4, lines 48 -54 and col. 4, lines 65-67 and col. 4, lines 21-27); a charging circuit (col. 4, lines 28-32); a station power source (col. 4, lines 28-32); and a detector that determines whether a communications device is docked at the station and provides status information as a result of the determination (column 4, lines 19-27).

Helstab does not specifically teach said docking station supplies energy to the docking station to a rechargeable energy source in the wireless communication device when the docking station is mobile.

In related art dealing with wireless equipment and docking stations, Ali teaches said docking station supplies energy to the docking station to a rechargeable energy source in the wireless communication device when the docking station is mobile (see Ali, ¶ 0065).

It would have been obvious to one skilled in the art at the time of invention to have included into Helstab's docking station, Ali's rechargeable means while the docking is mobile to provide wireless mobility to the user while in transit and further enhance the usability of the wireless device by providing a mobile charging station.

Helstab does not specifically teach of (a display device that displays information) received from the communications device', a switch having a pole a first terminal, and a second terminal, (the switch operable in response to status information indicating whether a

Art Unit: 2684

communications device is docked at the docking station); (a charging circuit) coupled to the pole of the switch; (a station power source coupled to the first terminal of the switch (note the brackets are provided for clarity in language and that it is believed that these limitations have been addressed in the above).

In a related art dealing with a cellular information terminal, Nojima teaches of a display device that displays information) received from the communications device (col. 3, line 64 –col. 4, line 4).

It would have been obvious to one skilled in the art at the time of invention to have included into Helstab's docking station, Nojima's data displaying capabilities, for the purposes of displaying user specific data and information (such as email), as taught by Nojima.

Helstab in view of Nojima do not specifically teach of a switch having a pole a first terminal, and a second terminal, (the switch operable in response to status information indicating whether a communications device is docked at the docking station); (a charging circuit) coupled to the pole of the switch; (a station power source) coupled to the first terminal of the switch (note the brackets are provided for clarity in language and that it is believed that these limitations have been addressed in the above; further it should be noted a charging system is noted in col. 4, lines 28 -32).

In a related art dealing with a portable terminal and cradle, Obata teaches of a first terminal a switch having a pole a first terminal (col.10, lines 30 -38, col. 18, lines 1-19), and a second terminal (col. 10, lines 30 -38, col. 18, lines 1-19 and col. 18, lines 30-42), the switch operable in response to status information indicating whether a communications device is docked at the docking station) (col. 10, lines 30-38, col. 18, lines 1-19), a charging circuit coupled to the

Art Unit: 2684

pole of the switch; (a station power source coupled to the first terminal of the switch (col. 10, lines 30-38, col. 18, lines 1-19).

It would have been obvious to one skilled in the art at the time of invention, to have included into Helstab in view of Nojima and Obata's charging system, Obata's circuit topology, for the purposes of selectively charging the mobile's battery upon need (as when the battery falls below a specified level), as taught Obata.

Regarding claim 19, Both Helstab and Obata further teach of wherein the first terminal of the switch is electrically coupled to the first terminal of the connector and the second terminal of the switch is electrically connected to the second terminal of the connector Helstab: col. 4, lines 47-54 and col. 4, lines 65 - 67 and Obata: col. 18, lines 1-19 and col. 18, lines 30-42).

Regarding claim 20, Helstab further teach of wherein the switch operates to connect the pole terminal to the first terminal in response to status information indicating that a communications device is not docked at the docking station (col. 4, lines 21 -27 and col. 2, lines 13-15)

Helstab in view of Nojima and Obata do not specifically teach of whereby the charging circuit then charges the station power source (though both have internal power supplies; Helstab: col. 4, lines 28 -32 and Obata: col. 17, lines 47-48).

It would have been obvious to one skilled in the art at the time of invention to have included into Helstab and Obata's charging system, Obata's means for charging the back-up battery as when the mobile is not in the cradle or fully charged), for the purposes of charging the back-up battery, such that the mobile could use the back-up battery when its power was not sufficient to permit transmission, as taught by Obata.

Claim 22 is rejected under 35 U.S.C. 103(a) as being unpatentable over Helstab et al. (Helstab, US Patent No. 6,073,031) in view of Ali et al (US No. 2003/0197679) and further in view of Nojima et al. (Nojima, US Patent No. 6,336,038) and Freadman (Freadman, US Patent No. 6,546,262).

Regarding claim 22, Helstab teaches of a method of enhancing the capabilities of a wireless communications device for information handling (Figure 2a), the method comprising the steps: mounting the wireless communications device on a docking station (Figure 2a) that comprises: (a) a cradle for the wireless communications device (col. 4, lines 2- 7), (b) a display device (col. 3, lines 3-5), (c) a connector for effecting an electrical interface to the wireless communication device (Figure 2a and column 4, lines 48 -54), (d) a station power source (col. 4, lines 28 -32), (e) a charging circuit (Figure 2a and col. 4, lines 28 -32 and col. 5, lines 29 -31), and a switch operable in response to information indicating whether or not a wireless communications device is docked at the docking station (col. 4, lines 48-54 and col. 4, lines 65- 67)., causing the station power source to be coupled to the wireless communications device (col. 4, lines 48-54 and col. 4, lines 65- 67)., and causing, in response to information that the wireless communication device is docked at the station, the charging circuit to charge the wireless communications device (col. 4, lines 48 -54 and col. 4, lines 65- 67 and col. 4, lines 2 -32).

Helstab does not specifically teach said docking station supplies energy to the docking station to a rechargeable energy source in the wireless communication device when the docking station is mobile.

In related art dealing with wireless equipment and docking stations, Ali teaches said docking station supplies energy to the docking station to a rechargeable energy source in the wireless communication device when the docking station is mobile (see Ali, ¶ 0065).

It would have been obvious to one skilled in the art at the time of invention to have included into Helstab's docking station, Ali's rechargeable means while the docking is mobile to provide wireless mobility to the user while in transit and further enhance the usability of the wireless device by providing a mobile charging station.

Helstab does not specifically teach of coupling a video output from the wireless communications device to the display device or (a display device that displays information) received from the wireless communications device (note the brackets are provided for clarity in language and that it is believed that these limitations have been addressed in the above).

In a related art dealing with a cellular information terminal, Nojima teaches of (a display device that displays information received from the wireless communications device (starting col. 3, line 64 and ending col. 4, line 4) and further of information handling (starting col. 3, line 64 and ending col. 4, line 4).

It would have been obvious to one skilled in the art at the time of invention to have included into Helstab's docking station, Nojima's data displaying capabilities, for the purposes of displaying user specific data and information (such as email), as taught by Nojima.

Helstab and Nojima do not specifically teach of coupling a video output from the wireless communications device to the display device.

In a related art dealing with handsets and cradle devices, Freadman teaches of coupling a video output from the wireless communications device to the display device (col. 3, lines 54-63).

It would have been obvious to one skilled in the art at the time of invention to have included into Helstab and Nojima's docking station, Freadman's video output, for the purposes of displaying characters and images from a smaller screen to a larger one, as taught by Freadman.

Claim 23 is rejected under 35 U.S.C. 103(a) as being unpatentable over Helstab et al. (Helstab, US Patent No. 6,073,031) in view of Ali et al (US No. 2003/0197679) and Nojima et al. (Nojima, US Patent No. 6,336,038) and Freadman (Freadman, US Patent No. 6,546,262) as applied to claim 22 above, and further in view of Obata et al. (Obata, US Patent No. 5,960,208).

Regarding claim 23, Both Helstab and Freadman further teach of wherein, in response to information indicating that a wireless communications device is docked at the docking station, the switch couples the charging circuit to a voltage source included with the wireless communications device (col. 4, lines 28 -32, col. 4, lines 47 -54 and col. 4, lines 65 - 67 and Freadman: col. 4, lines 5-8),

Helstab and Nojima and Freadman do not specifically teach of in response to information indicating that a wireless communications device is not docked at the station, the switch couples the charging circuit to the station power source.

In a related art dealing with a portable terminal and cradle, Obata teaches of in response to information indicating that a wireless communications device is docked at the docking station, the switch couples the charging circuit to a voltage source included with the wireless communications device (Obata: col. 17, lines 41 -53) but not specifically in response to information indicating that a wireless communications device is not docked at the station, the switch couples the charging circuit to the station power source.

It would have been obvious to one skilled in the art at the time of invention to have included into Helstab, Nojima, and Freadman's charging system, Obata's means for charging the back-up battery (as when the mobile is not in the cradle or fully charged), for the purposes of charging the back-up battery such that the mobile could use the back-up battery when its power was not sufficient to permit transmission, as taught by Obata.

Claims 24 and 25 are rejected under 35 U.S.C. 103(a) as being unpatentable over Helstab et al. (Helstab, US Patent No. 6,073,031) in view of Ali et al (US No. 2003/0197679) and Nojima et al. (Nojima, US Patent No. 6,336,038) and Freadman (Freadman, US Patent No. 6,546,262) and further in view of Obata et al. (Obata, US Patent No. 5,960,208).

Regarding claim 24, Helstab teaches of an assembly for docking a wireless communication device (WCD) so as to enhance the capabilities of the device (Figure 2a), the assembly comprising: a housing having a receptacle for the WCD (col. 4, lines 47- 51); a display device (col. 3, lines 3-5); an internal chargeable power source (col. 4, lines 28 - 32); a charging circuit (col. 4, lines 28-32); a switching circuit, responsive to a predetermined status of the assembly (column 4, lines 65 - 67); detachable means for coupling the charging circuit to a source of electrical power (col. 4, lines 28 - 32); a connector for electrically coupling the docking station to the WCD (col. 4, lines 48 - 54); and a support for the housing (col. 1, lines 65-67 and col. 5, lines 53 - 55).

Helstab does not specifically teach of that selectively couples the charging circuit to the internal chargeable power source; a video interface circuit for coupling the video output of the WCD to the display device or (a display device that displays information) received from the

Art Unit: 2684

wireless communications device (note the brackets are provided for clarity in language and that it is believed that these limitations have been addressed in the above).

In related art dealing with wireless equipment and docking stations, Ali teaches said docking station supplies energy to the docking station to a rechargeable energy source in the wireless communication device when the docking station is mobile (see Ali, ¶ 0065).

It would have been obvious to one skilled in the art at the time of invention to have included into Helstab's docking station, Ali's rechargeable means while the docking is mobile to provide wireless mobility to the user while in transit and further enhance the usability of the wireless device by providing a mobile charging station.

In a related art dealing with a cellular information terminal, Nojima teaches of (a display device that displays information received from the wireless communications device (starting col. 3, line 64 and ending col. 4, line 4).

It would have been obvious to one skilled in the art at the time of invention to have included into Helstab's docking station, Nojima's data displaying capabilities, for the purposes of displaying user specific data and information (such as email), as taught by Nojima.

Helstab and Nojima do not specifically teach of that selectively couples the charging circuit to the internal chargeable power source; a video interface circuit for coupling the video output of the WCD to the display device .

In a related art dealing with handsets and cradle devices, Freadman teaches of a video interface circuit for coupling the video output of the WCD to the display device (col. 3, lines 54 - 63).



Art Unit: 2684

It would have been obvious to one skilled in the art at the time of invention to have included into Helstab and Nojima's docking station, Freadman's video output, for the purposes of displaying characters and images from a smaller screen to a larger one, as taught by Freadman.

Helstab in view of Freadman do not specifically teach of that selectively couples the charging circuit to the internal chargeable power source.

In a related art dealing with a portable terminal and cradle, Obata teaches of that selectively couples the charging circuit to the internal chargeable power source (Obata: col.17, lines 41-53 and col. 18, lines 30 -42).

It would have been obvious to one skilled in the art at the time of invention to have included into Helstab, Nojima and Freadman's charging system, Obata's means for charging the back-up battery (as when the mobile is not in the cradle or fully charged), for the purposes of charging the back-up battery such that the mobile could use the back-up battery when its power was not sufficient to permit transmission, as taught by Obata.

Regarding claim 25, Helstab and Freadman further teach of wherein the display device is mounted on a planar surface of the housing (Helstab: col. 5, lines 44 – 49 and Freadman: col. 3, lines 56 -63).

Claims 26 and 27 are rejected under 35 U.S.C. 103(a) as being unpatentable over Helstab et al. (Helstab, US Patent No. 6,073,031) in view of Ali et al (US No. 2003/0197679) and Nojima et al. (Nojima, US Patent No. 6,336,038) and Freadman (Freadman, US Patent No.

Art Unit: 2684

6,546,262) and further in view of Obata et al. (Obata, US Patent No. 5,960,208) as applied to claim 25 above Kobayashi (Kobayashi, UP Patent No. 4,776,553).

Regarding claim 26, Helstab, in view of Nojima and Freadman and Obata, do not specifically teach of wherein the support for the housing is a stand having a base portion and an oblique back portion.

In a related art dealing with cradle mounts, Kobayashi teaches of wherein the support for the housing is a stand having a base portion and an oblique back portion (col. 1, lines 40 -50).

It would have been obvious to one skilled in the art at the time of invention to have included into Helstab, in view of Nojima and Freadman and Obata's cradle, Kobayashi's mounting system, for the purposes positioning a cradle at a specific angle and orientation, as specified by the user, as taught by Kobayashi.

Regarding claim 27, Helstab, in view of Nojima and Freadman and Obata, do not specifically teach of wherein the support is rotatably attached to the housing.

In a related art dealing with cradle mounts, Kobayashi teaches of wherein the support is rotatably attached to the housing (Figures 1 - 10 and column 1, lines 40 -50).

It would have been obvious to one skilled in the art at the time of invention to have included into Helstab, in view of Nojima and Freadman and Obata's cradle, Kobayashi's mounting system, for the purposes positioning a cradle at a specific angle and orientation, as specified by the user, as taught by Kobayashi.

Art Unit: 2684

***Conclusion***

Any inquiry concerning this communication or earlier communications from the examiner should be directed to Edan Orgad whose telephone number is 703-305-4223. The examiner can normally be reached on 8:00AM to 5:30PM with every other Friday off.

If attempts to reach the examiner by telephone are unsuccessful, the examiner's supervisor, Nay Maung can be reached on 703-308-7745. The fax phone number for the organization where this application or proceeding is assigned is 703-872-9306.

Information regarding the status of an application may be obtained from the Patent Application Information Retrieval (PAIR) system. Status information for published applications may be obtained from either Private PAIR or Public PAIR. Status information for unpublished applications is available through Private PAIR only. For more information about the PAIR system, see <http://pair-direct.uspto.gov>. Should you have questions on access to the Private PAIR system, contact the Electronic Business Center (EBC) at 866-217-9197 (toll-free).

10 2/17/05  
EDAN ORGAD  
PATENT EXAMINER/TELECOM.